



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for war purposes, have piled up to the almost inconceivable total of twenty-three thousand millions (23,000,000,000) of dollars. There must be a limit to this vast expenditure. Well may we ask whether the maximum has not been reached. Already some of the nations are dangerously near the vortex of bankruptcy.

For still another reason a resort to peaceful measures as a substitute for war seems inevitable. We must not lose sight of the contribution which science is making to this end. Think of the amazing increase in the murderous effectiveness of the weapons of war which has taken place in the last few years, say since the close of the Franco-German war. I read in a late paper that our Navy Department had recently adopted a rifle, the invention of a Connecticut artisan, which would fire five shots in three seconds and send a bullet through the bodies of two men standing one behind the other at the distance of three miles. And there are said to be cannon now in use by which a projectile can be thrown eight miles and at that distance penetrate an eighteen inch plate of Harveyized steel. I have heard also that a gun has been invented which will throw eighteen hundred shots in a minute.

To-day were two great nations to make their appeal to the arbitrament of war they might array their armies miles apart and yet murderously destroy each other, indeed a near approach would be impossible, and so wholesale would be the slaughter that there would be none left to care for the wounded or to bury the dead. Such warfare would be not conquest, not victory, but extermination for both armies.

Will not the nations stand aghast and hesitate long before entering upon a contest involving such direful consequences? Is it too much then to claim science as an ally, and that the very terrible effectiveness of these modern weapons of human butchery is a guarantee of peace?

While I speak of these material conditions as making inevitable the abandonment of war as a means of settling national differences, I by no means underestimate the value of moral agencies in creating a correct public sentiment. I agree with all that has been said here along that line. No one deprecates more than I do the spirit of militarism of which there has recently been such a widespread revival. The demand for military training in our schools and the establishment of Boys' Brigades even under the roofs of the churches should be an occasion of sorrow and alarm to all who believe that the true greatness, the prosperity and permanence of our nation will be found in the cultivation of the arts of peace rather than the arts of war. There are no doubt many good citizens who have taken up with this new movement inconsiderately, but whose sober second thought will condemn it.

The teaching of our schools has, I think, been all along in an erroneous direction; most of the histories which we put into the hands of the children speak of war as though it had been the most praiseworthy employment of mankind, and its heroes are held up for unstinted admiration, while the achievements of peace and the heroes of peace are too often only subordinately mentioned.

Notwithstanding some of these much to be regretted present conditions, it cannot be doubted that arbitration as a substitute for war is growing in popular favor.

Let it be our duty to keep this great question to the front, as second in national importance to no other, and concerning the welfare of not one nation only, but of all mankind.

INTERNATIONAL JURISPRUDENCE.

BY SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK.

From an address delivered before the Harvard Law School Association June 25th.

Ten years ago the Supreme Court of the United States declared, in a judgment of admirable clearness and good sense, which I trust will be followed in England when the occasion comes, that in matters of general commercial principle "a diversity in the law as administered on the two sides of the Atlantic is greatly to be deprecated." Shall this remain for all time a mere deprecation, appealing forcibly, no doubt, to the best sense of our highest tribunals, but still subject to human accidents? Is there not any way beside and beyond the discussion of lawyers in books and otherwise, of assisting our ultimate authorities to agree? Would not the best and surest way be, that in matters of great weight and general importance to the common law, they should assist one another? Certainly there are difficulties in the way of any such process, but is there, in truth, any insuperable difficulty?

The House of Lords, as we know, is entitled to consult the judges of the land, though not bound either to consult them in any particular case, or, when they are consulted, to decide according to their opinion or that of the majority. There is nothing I know of in our constitution to prevent the House of Lords, if it should think fit, from desiring the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, by some indirect process, if not directly, and as a matter of personal favor, to communicate their collective or individual opinions on any questions of general law. Nor, I should apprehend, can there be anything in the constitution of that most honorable court or the office of its judges to prevent them from acceding to such a request if it could be done without prejudice to their regular duties.

Could the precedent be made once or twice in an informal and semi-official manner, it might safely be left to posterity to devise the means of turning a laudable occasional usage into a custom clothed with adequate form. As for the difficulties, they are of the kind that can be made to look formidable by persons unwilling to move, and can be made to vanish by active good will. Objections on the score of distance and delay would be inconsiderable, not to say frivolous. From Westminster to Washington is for our mails and dispatches hardly so much of a journey as it was a century ago from Westminster to an English judge on the northern or western circuit.

Opinions from every supreme appellate court in every English-speaking jurisdiction might now be collected within the time that Lord Eldon commonly devoted to the preliminary consideration of an appeal from the master of the rolls. At this day there is no mechanical obstacle in the way of judgments being rendered which should represent the best legal mind, not of this or that portion of the domains that acknowledge the common law, but of the whole. There is no reason why we should not live in hope of our system of judicial law being confirmed and exalted in a judgment seat more than national, in a tribunal more comprehensive, more authoritative and more august than any the world has yet known.

Some one may ask whether we look to see these things ourselves or hope for them in our children's time. I cannot tell. The movement of ideas will not be measured beforehand in days or years.